

"TH

"W

A S

WILLIA

# "THE ABRAHAMIC SACRIFICE,"

IN CONNECTION WITH

PILATE'S QUESTION :

## "WHAT IS TRUTH"?

DISCUSSED BY

AN ORTHODOX OLD JUDGE

AND

A SCEPTICAL YOUNG LAWYER.

---

HALIFAX, N. S. :

WILLIAM MACNAB, PRINTER, No. 10 PRINCE STREET,

1883.

"TH

"W

A

A SC

WILLIA

# "THE ABRAHAMIC SACRIFICE,"

IN CONNECTION WITH

PILATE'S QUESTION :

"WHAT IS TRUTH"?

DISCUSSED BY

AN ORTHODOX OLD JUDGE

AND

A SCEPTICAL YOUNG LAWYER.

---

HALIFAX, N. S. :

WILLIAM MACNAB, PRINTER, No. 10 PRINCE STREET,  
1883.

The  
ing a s  
polis, w  
Fundy.  
basin, t  
calmly  
propelle  
proceed  
remains  
from the  
already  
especiall  
duced an  
lightly a  
debarked  
order to  
retired to  
by an ag  
painted p  
excavate  
The who  
being dir  
sinewy h  
an interes  
from their



## WHAT IS TRUTH?

---

"Look you, who comes here?  
A young man and an old in solemn talk."

—Shakespeare.

The residence of an old judge, with whom I have been making a short *séjour*, is situate near the beautiful basin of Annapolis, which is connected by a narrow strait with the Bay of Fundy. As the judge and I sauntered by the shore of the basin, the waters of which sparkled in the sun's rays, sleeping calmly between the full and the ebb of the tide, we observed, propelled by noiseless paddles, a little squadron of bark canoes, proceeding, in line, to a burying-ground, there to deposit the remains of one of the Micmaes whose unit had been subtracted from the number of that degraded, but not uninteresting tribe, already much reduced by the influences of civilization, and, especially, by the use of ardent spirits which the whites introduced among them. In a few minutes the canoes stranded so lightly as scarcely to displace a pebble on the beach, and by the debarked Indians were drawn up and left on the shore. In order to witness unobtrusively the approaching ceremony, we retired to a grove at hand. The funeral train was marshalled by an aged Micmac with order and decency. The coffin, of unpainted pine, not rudely made, was borne to a grave silently excavated, and the body, placed in it, was covered with mould. The whole party then knelt around the grave, their movements being directed by the chief, whose long, flowing locks, thin, sinewy hands, uplifted and expanded, and closed eyes, formed an interesting spectacle. Then arose with untaught harmony from their deep, guttural voices, in a dialect unknown to us, a

solemn chant, which was followed by a prayer, the sincerity and devotion of which could not be doubted. The ceremony ended, the Indians reembarked, and paddled away as silently as they came.

After they were gone, we came forth from our retreat, and loitered at the spot of interment. "This turf covers," said the judge, "our red brother, who there rests from his labors." I remarked, "He was, I suppose, 'a light unto himself;' but how far, think you, will his responsibility, if such awaits him, be affected by 'his works that follow him,' which were influenced by no higher principle than the instinct of the bear or the deer that he slew for food?" "As to the purpose," replied my friend, "which in the moral economy of the world the life and works of the poor savage were designed to subserve, I could probably gather no information from reason, or from revelation; so that I shall leave your question to the hereafter, which will, no doubt, answer it, and some others of far greater importance that perplex us now. I have learned 'not to exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me.' Nevertheless, as your query seems to imply a doubt in your mind as to what lies beyond, in 'the undiscovered country,' I shall inflict on you a homily over this grave which may help you to resolve it if it exists. I have been long anchored in the creed which my good old mother taught me by her knee, from our Church catechism. To travel out of that involves a danger of being 'puffed up,' as St. Paul calls it. There were such inflations in his days as there are in ours. If you, young man, are looking to your own intellect alone for an answer to the great question of your future, you will die with it unanswered; and you may find, when the veil is lifted, that you have been 'stumbling on the dark mountains,' when it would have been better for you to have accepted the proffered 'light of the world.' He who stood before the Roman Governor, when the latter, in the very noon-day blaze of the human intellect, anxiously, or despondingly or derisively, asked of the former, '*What is truth?*' was, Him-

self, t  
questi

"N  
the m  
He de

"It  
for hin  
his acc  
shining

"De  
can be,  
revelat  
Eviden  
quiring

"It i  
gard as  
revelati  
logic of  
heart.

which, a  
which h  
establish  
as a prin

"Love  
by the g  
ceiving  
er love  
for his f  
the Fath  
eth fathe

"He s  
of the di  
He that  
him and

self, the only reliable answer that has ever been given to that question.

"Not to speak of the profound wisdom of His doctrine, or of the marvellous eloquence of His life, we may remember, that He declared Himself to be 'the Light of the world.'

"It is of infinite moment to you and to me to determine each for himself, whether he is truly enlightened by that light as his accepted guide of life, or whether it is to him but 'a light shining in darkness that comprehendeth it not.'

"Demonstration of the truth of Christianity there never can be, from what must necessarily be the nature of a divine revelation, and from what we know to be the nature of man. Evidence of some other kind, therefore, must satisfy a mind inquiring on that point, or it must remain unsatisfied.

"It is clearly the teaching of the Book which Christians regard as divine, that effectual conviction of the origin of the revelation which it contains must be produced, if at all, not by logic of the head, but by what I venture to call *logic of the heart*. Moreover, such appears to me to be the only means by which, as man is constituted, the truth of a revelation of that which lies beyond the reach of sense and experience can be so established in man's apprehension, as to influence and regulate, as a principle, his conduct.

"Love, or gratitude—a thing purely of the heart—is declared by the great Teacher to be the condition necessary for so receiving Him as to obtain redemption by Him. He said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.' 'If ye love me, keep my commandments.' 'As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you.' 'He that loveth father and mother more than me, is not worthy of me.'

"He speaks of that same affection, also, as related to *evidence* of the divine authority of his doctrine. These are his words: 'He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him.' After he had said 'My doc-



trine is not mine, but his that sent me,' he added, 'If any man will do [*i.e.*, as the Greek is, *desireth to do*] his will, he shall *know* of the doctrine whether it be of God.'

"The condition on which that knowledge is thus declared to depend, is not an intellectual one. It is the existence of a sincere desire to do the will of God, arising from the love of God—an affection of the heart! With the source of that principle—perfectly clear from Scripture—we are not, at present, concerned.

"Again, when our Lord said, 'of such' [little children] 'is the kingdom of heaven,' it was as if He had said, 'If ye would attain to that kingdom, the process by which you may expect to be convinced that I am 'the way' that conducts to it, is not an exercise of your reasoning faculty, but it is the swaying of your hearts toward me from simple, trusting love, as little children, incapable of the logic of the mind, are drawn by their loving instincts toward their earthly parents.' The divine source of the doctrine in question is thus pronounced to be provable by *heart logic*, which is but another form of words to express 'the law written on the heart!'

"In the texts of the New Scriptures just quoted, we have, in effect, divine love appealing to human hearts. Observe how human hearts have responded, and are responding, to that appeal. The Psalmist, in prophetic anticipation, most likely, of what I have noticed, exclaimed, 'Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.'

"It is, undeniably, true, that that same response has, in every hour since the great act was enacted on Calvary, been made by human hearts, so convinced of what they regarded as the 'inestimable gift,' as neither to demand, nor to need a mere intellectual assurance of the reality of it. Of that response the heartfelt sincerity and the earnestness have been proved in every case by the self-denying devotion of a life, and by a faith in

the h  
chan

"A  
mani  
such  
but c  
was t  
fishes  
influe  
the su  
some  
produ

Her  
the tr  
regard  
where  
kind;  
the po  
"In  
that de

"We  
in whi  
tion of  
sive, be  
under  
on ear  
of a tra  
with a  
of inter  
scarcely  
which  
tion to  
his obe  
so view  
in its

the hour of death stronger than death—in a word, by a nature changed from selfishness to love.

“An enlightened mind, rigidly scrutinizing the outward manifestations of such a regenerated nature, and *seeing that such an effect cannot be ascribed to mere human causes*, cannot but consider as great a miracle to have been thus operated, as was the feeding of the five thousand by the few loaves and fishes. It were as rational to refer the last as the first to human influences. Is it consistent with sound reasoning, then, when the subject discussed is the evidence of Revelation, to ignore, as some do, a heart-logic which claims so high an original, and has produced such results?”

Here, interrupting my venerable friend, I said, “Admitting the truth of what you have urged, I feel, nevertheless, that, in regard to the subject of your remarks, a cultivated intellect, where the heart is untouched, demands evidence of another kind; I am, therefore, curious to hear what you have to say on the point of mental conviction, or of evidence strictly such.”

“In my opinion,” he replied, “an honest mind will not make that demand in vain.”

“We have,” he continued to say, “in the Hebrew Scriptures, in which (it may be observed by the way) God’s communication of His nature and attributes would appear to be progressive, beginning with a declaration of eternal self-existence, and, under the Gospel dispensation, ending in a Being, who taught, on earth, as a human impersonation of the Godhead, a narrative of a transaction, in which Jehovah is represented as an actor with a then living man. It expressly points to something future of interest to the whole human race. It is unsatisfactory—scarcely intelligible—where it appears in the history with which it is connected, if it be viewed as having a mere relation to the human subject, or as a mere trial of his faith or of his obedience. Many commentators have acknowledged that, so viewed, they fail to understand it. The narrative appeared in its present connection ages before an event took place to

which it *may be*, and to which alone of all future recorded events it *can be*, referred.

"If man, with his finite mind, would solve a question of the source of a revelation purporting to be divine, there are but two grounds of investigation open to him, of which the result can in strictness be called evidence.

"Of one of them—a spiritual communication from without—I have already spoken as 'Logic of the Heart.' To him whose conduct is consciously regulated by its influence, it is, at once, a convincing proof of the Gospel, and an assured pledge of his future life and happiness. The second ground is that on which I mainly rely to satisfy your appeal on behalf of the *intellect*. It formed a subject of our Lord's teaching to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus. Of that I purpose to speak presently.

"I do not shut my eyes to some difficulties that with more or less force, according to the degree of faith or the acuteness of intellect, perplex many minds; but I maintain that in the narrative and the event to which I refer it there is evidence of a kind and of a cogency that ought to satisfy the most highly trained mind, that the gospel story is of supernatural origin as regards the great central figure of it, and the main incidents of the Greek biographies. Bear in mind that, if that narrative, viewed as I view it, is evidence for the purpose indicated, *it is but a selected portion of a large class of evidence of a kindred nature that conduces to the same result.*

"The 'Christus' of whom Tacitus wrote as crucified under Pilate, is identical with the Christ of the Gospels.

"Let any man of intelligence seek for evidence derived from the old Scriptures read with the Greek documents, that the Jesus of these last was what he is therein represented to have been, and that he suffered as represented. If, considering that his faculties are limited, and that he is conducting inquiry in a subject which treats of the unseen and the unknown, that inquirer finds, that a Hebrew prophet or patriarch did, in any

way, i  
marka  
him, t  
person  
not in  
eral tr  
that p

"I v  
to the  
life cor  
of thes  
Jesus c  
after th  
science  
things  
suggest

"I o  
low, be

"We  
of his o  
ribly se  
Jehoval  
will con  
they sh  
ment, t  
has spo

"We  
said, 's  
reason f  
great n  
in him.  
that the  
thing th  
plishme  
son. W

way, in that which was a remote future to him, point to a remarkable person, and to remarkable incidents connected with him, that are related in the Greek Scriptures, and to none other person and incidents that are the subjects of history—he cannot in such conditions reasonably refuse his assent to the general truth of those Scriptures, so far as they profess to refer to that particular person.

“I will suppose that inquirer to have directed his attention to the Abrahamic sacrifice, and to the incidents of Abraham’s life connected therewith, as recorded in Genesis. The narrative of these was where it is now found ages before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth. It could not, therefore, have been forged after the event to which I suppose it to refer—no human prescience could have foreseen that event—no state of mundane things co-existed with the date of the narrative that could have suggested the event as a possible result.

“I offer these preliminary observations, and those that follow, before proceeding to examine the narrative.

“We find from the previous history of Abraham that a trial of his obedience, *considered merely as such*,—especially a terribly severe one—would not seem to have been necessary, for Jehovah is recorded to have said of him, ‘I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he has spoken of him.’

“We read that Jehovah, before the destruction of Sodom, said, ‘shall I hide from Abraham the thing which I do?’ The reason follows:—‘*Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him.*’ Surely, in view of this, it is far from improbable that the Lord would not altogether hide from Abraham ‘the thing that he did’—*i. e.*, designed to do—in order to the accomplishment of that very promise which is indicated in the reason. We have the more ground for thinking that Jehovah did

not hide from the patriarch that thing, if we regard the fact, that, in the sequel of the virtual sacrifice of Isaac, Abraham, as his last act in the drama, named the place 'Jehovah Jireh'—'the Lord will see or provide.'

"Can we reach the import of these words? I think we can, by a fair and natural construction. Isaac had said, 'Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?' and Abraham had answered, 'My son, God *will provide* himself a lamb for a burnt-offering.' After this, God had provided for virtual sacrifice Isaac, and for an actual substituted one a ram. Abraham, in view of what *had thus passed*,—after God *had provided* the ram—proceeds to name the place, and call it—(what? not by words importing that 'there God *had provided*,' but) 'God *will provide*'—*i. e.*, will provide a *then future* sacrifice—a *then future* lamb for a burnt-offering. This is not an unreasonable interpretation of the words. I hope to show it to be the true one.

"We, in reading the story, distinguish between the condition of the patriarch's feelings as we try to enter into them, when he received and acted on the command, on the one hand, and what we can conceive to have been in the Divine mind when the command was given, on the other. In this view there is nothing in the nature of the command that is revolting to human sentiment. There existed not from the first a divine purpose that Abraham should slay his son. It is not, therefore, necessary to import into the case for an explanation of the narrative any considerations derived from Abraham's probable familiarity with human sacrifices before he became a monotheist. There is nothing, therefore, in the narrative that could be supposed to give a sanction to human sacrifices.

"It is obvious to a Christian why Abraham should be made to feel the intensity of a father's sufferings under the circumstances, and why he should have some intimation given him that there existed a tremendous necessity for some such a sacrifice.



"Let us now notice the features of the narrative in order to see if this portion of the Old Scriptures concerns the Jesus Christ of the Greek Scriptures. I use the word 'virtual' but once. Where it is to be supplied afterwards will be apparent. *When the features referred to are indicated, it will be unnecessary for me to notice the Greek parallels.* Those features may be presented thus:—Jehovah—the Heavenly Father—appoints the sacrifice. A human father virtually sacrifices his son, brought into life preternaturally,—a son, being 'the seed of a woman,' in a peculiar sense—his only son, the son he loved. He—the human father—consents to, and takes part in the sacrifice. 'The father took the fire in his hand, and the knife.' The son dies, and lives after his death. 'And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son.' *Thus the son died.* 'And Abraham took the ram and offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son.' *Thus the son that was sacrificed was released from the bonds of death, and lived again.* 'Even from the dead his father received him in a figure.' The son dies by violence, and on the wood—on wood that he is made to bear to the place of sacrifice. 'And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it on Isaac, his son.' \* 'And Abraham laid Isaac on the altar, upon the wood, and bound Isaac his son.' \*The son consents to be the victim. After the father had replied to the son, 'My son, God will provide himself a lamb,' the son, physically able effectually to resist, submissively consents to become that lamb, and to be bound and laid upon the wood. Observe, too, as showing the perfect agreement between the father and the son, it is said—not merely once, but it is repeated—'and they went both of them together.' They go both together, and they alone, to the place of sacrifice. 'Of the people there were none with me.'

"The son, thus sacrificed, was the previously appointed type and channel 'of blessings for all the nations of the earth.'

"The sacrifice was completed on the third day from that on which the father leads out the son for the sacrifice. Such is

\* John xviii. 12; xix. 17.

Cf. Gen. xxii. 3.

the effect of the words of the narrative. During the interval and up to the moment when the son is unbound, he remains under the sentence of death. On the third day the son is released. The place was not 'so far off' (Gen. xxii. 4, 5) that the ass being left, the lad was unnecessarily compelled to carry the wood to any considerable distance, on 'the third day.'

"We may not, perhaps, necessarily infer from the narrative that the sacrifice was thus shown to be of an *atoning* character. Abraham, however, if he then 'saw Christ's day,' must have viewed it in that light. We may note, also, that the sacrifice is represented as a 'burnt offering.' Such is mentioned six times in the thirteen verses of the narrative, and it is mentioned only in two or three other places in Genesis. If Abraham understood that kind of sacrifice in the sense made to attach to it in Leviticus, he must have known that his son in the transaction was made by divine appointment an expiating victim. 'And he' (the offerer) 'shall put his hand upon the head of the *burnt offering*; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.'

"And now, let me put to you this question:—Looking to history developed since Abraham's day, has any human being, *save one*, appeared on the theatre of this world, whose character and career were such as can be said to have even conduced to 'bless all the nations upon earth'?

"In the whole history of man, *not including the Greek Scriptures*, there is no other instance beside that in the Hebrew narrative recorded, so far as I know, of an *innocent man consenting to become a sacrificial victim upon an altar raised by his father, upon a mere intimation received from that father that a God required or approved his submission to the sacrifice, and without the object of the sacrifice being communicated to the intended victim.* If this be true, it is inferential as to a connection between the Abrahamic sacrifice and that on Calvary.

"It appears to me but one explanation can be given of all this.

"Supposing the narrative not to point to something which is

not  
that  
be g  
"I  
the m  
rewa  
tive  
fore  
Isaac  
"B  
woma  
physi  
we co  
mode  
so sev  
one,—  
featur  
ticular  
place  
Son—  
lar gro  
that v  
the clo  
tion of  
Greek  
the sold  
an ind  
"At  
effect,  
er's con  
Isaac s  
tion of  
Jews—  
1-18) a  
\* Com  
+ Cf. C

not on the surface of it, how is it to be explained? I assert that, on that supposition, no reasonable explanation of it can be given.

"I make this assertion advisedly. The promise declared in the narrative after the act in obedience was not a result or a reward of that act. This is shown by the fact that the narrative but repeats the very promise that had been declared before the act. The only new feature is an intimated relation of Isaac to the promise. It had before been filled by Abraham.\*

"But, bearing in mind the primal prophecy of the seed of the woman, and the negative relation in which Isaac, *in regard to physical generation*, stood both to Abraham and to Sarah,† if we consider the purpose to have been a *preintimation of the mode in which the promise would be performed*, then, the trial so severe, in view of the already proved obedience of the tried one,—the solemnity of the transaction, marked, as it is, by the feature of concurrent action of a father and his son—the particular circumstances, including a special designation of the place of sacrifice, and its remoteness,—the submission of the Son—the eventual provision of the burnt offering—the particular ground assigned for the promised blessing 'in Isaac,' and that with the emphasis of an oath—the naming of the place, at the close of the events—the character of the name—the duration of the whole action—all become, when viewed with the Greek documents, most significant; *while the reverse is true, if the sole purpose had relation to the obedience or to the faith of an individual man.*

"At verse 18 the transaction ends, Jehovah announcing, in effect, for the first time (verse 16-18), that *because of the father's consent to the sacrifice of his son* (ch. xxi. 12; xxii. 18) in Isaac should all the nations be blessed. This eventual limitation of the blessing to *the son* shows that *that Jew*—not the Jews—was the type-intimated. 'The effect of the whole (xxii. 1-18) as we regard it in the light of the Gospels—is that the

\* Compare ch. xii. 3; xviii. 18; with ch. xxii. 18; and ch. xxi. 12. *Rom. ix. 7, 21.*

† Cf. Gen. xvi. 2; xvii. 17; xviii. 11; Rom. iv. 19; with Luke i. 34, 35.

blessing was to be accomplished *because of*, as well as by means of, the sacrifice by a father of an only son, especially beloved—a son supernaturally engendered in the womb of a woman by the Spirit of the Father of all—a son who, by command of his father, and with his own consent, was to be immolated. *All this may have been*, and, in view of John viii. 56, all of it *that is necessarily implied in the seeing Christ's day* was understood then and there by the Patriarch, and that eighteen centuries before the great sacrifice recorded in the Greek biographies. 'All this—even if not foreknown by Abraham—was then pre-indicated for us.'

"No man, in face of what the biographies show, could reasonably assert that Jesus did, from enthusiasm, procure himself to be a sufferer in view of the narrative, or that the author of either of those documents designed to present him otherwise than by implication, as an antitype of Isaac. Moreover, the negative testimony of the Gospels would refute the assertion first supposed. Neither our Lord, nor any of his followers, during his life on earth, ever expressly adverted to the Abrahamic sacrifice. Not even when He declared Himself, in His reference to the brazen serpent, to be the fulfilment of prophecy; nor when He spoke of Abraham having seen his day; nor when speaking of Himself as the Son of God.

"St. John did not write of the binding of Christ, nor of the imposition on Him of the wood of the cross, until after the ascension. When John Baptist, seeing Jesus coming to him, exclaimed, 'Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world,' he did not add, 'and in him will be fulfilled what Abraham saw.' So that there can be no pretence for asserting that the author of either of the biographies narrated as genuine incidents of Christ's history what he borrowed, in the respects just noticed from the Hebrew Scriptures.

"Here, let me ask,—Was He of whom John so spoke, one of the seed of Abraham? Is taking away the sin of the world a blessing to all the nations of the earth? Is any other event registered on the page of history that can be so characterized?

\* See note at end.

"I  
been  
quest  
ordai  
rative  
vealed  
the re  
does n

"It  
should  
ceive s

"A  
arch in  
the vis  
Sacrific  
real an

"Do  
Whe  
not see  
will be  
of God  
may be

To w  
arguing  
phecy o  
as an ex  
tative n  
human  
tion of t  
tain the

"This  
distant p  
solution  
will be s

\* See W

"It is not necessary to notice the various views that have been taken by commentators of the purpose of the narrative in question. Some have considered, as I do, that Jehovah had ordained *that by means of the transaction related in the narrative that then future sacrifice should be in some degree revealed, or adumbrated to the mind of Abraham.*\* Whether the revelation was made by real facts or by dream or vision, does not affect my argument.

"It is easy to conceive why that representative Hebrew, should have been the selected one of a selected race, so to receive a pre-intimation of the greatest event that history records.

"A result of all this is to my mind evidence that the patriarch in the particular transaction 'saw Christ's day' through the vista of the centuries interposed between it and the Great Sacrifice. If he did, it was by the operation of a miracle as real and as great as any related in the Greek documents!

"Do you assent to this?"

Whereupon I ventured to say to my venerable friend, "I do not see that the words used by Abraham in naming the place will bear the weight of an independent prophecy of 'the Lamb of God.' Moreover, the coincidences supposed are few, and may be fortuitous or imaginary."

To which the old judge replied as follows: "I am not merely arguing back from a proved event to what I take to be a prophecy of it; but I am also endeavoring to present to your mind, as an exceptional case, *a special revelation made to a representative man, of a future which concerned him and the whole human race!* As to the words used by Abraham in designation of the place, I never supposed that they *alone* would sustain the weight of a prophecy.

"This, like many other matters connected with a dim and distant past, which are subjects of inquiry now, depends for solution on a balance of reasonable conjectures; but I think it will be shown that my explanation of the words in question is

\* See Warburton. Div. Leg. B. 6, sec. 5.



the true one, as viewed in the connection in which they will be presented.

"It has been generally assumed that the place was named in reference to the words addressed by Abraham to Isaac in answer to the enquiry of the latter. And with reason, if the words had stood alone, unconnected with circumstances extraneous to the narrative and with subsequent events, in the light of which the designation must be interpreted. It is because the words do not stand alone, but are a part of a significant whole—being as such, in effect, a prophetic declaration made by Abraham, based on a pre-intimation to him of a remarkable future,—that the received interpretation must be rejected. My argument, as it affects the designation, is founded on this view: and you must keep it in mind while considering what I am about to offer.

"Let us try to enter into the sentiments of the patriarch when he so addressed his son. The latter says to the former: 'Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?' The former answers: 'My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering.' The father's sentiments at that moment may be interpreted thus: His language was, 'My son, God will provide Himself a lamb.' His thought—too deep for utterance, was, 'Alas! I know too well what that provision will be. My faith in Jehovah alone sustains me under an awful sense of it.'

"Observe—if the patriarch, when he addressed the words to his son, *then* foresaw the substituted ram, there was no trial at all. Up to the moment when the hand about to use the knife was arrested, the patriarch could not have consciously used the words, in a sense prophetic of the Lamb of God. He must, therefore, have spoken them, although with resignation and submission to the will of Jehovah, with an agonized heart, even if he believed in the restoration to life of his son after the immolation, for a father's heart was throbbing in his bosom, while he knew that by his own hand Isaac was to be slain! *It may possibly be* that up to that moment, the designed disclosure was

not  
not  
migi  
fice!  
phic  
"A  
spect  
then,  
were  
the n  
his so  
pendi  
whel  
sition  
exper

"Be  
tradit  
said, t  
traditi  
even a  
erally  
accomp  
the Lo  
associa

"Th  
'And h  
it is sa  
The sa  
profess  
French  
Abraha  
provide  
Eterna

"I c  
perhaps  
God, w

not completely made to Abraham, because until then he would not be as fully taught as a human father could be, what it might cost a Heavenly Father to consent to an analogous sacrifice! Before rejecting this *as an unreasonable, anthropomorphic hypothesis*, read Acts xx. 28; Rom. v. 8; viii. 32.

"At the crisis when the ram was sacrificed, the words, as respects their surface meaning, were completely spent. Why, then, should it be thought that they—words of future *form*—were adopted, otherwise than as made to speak *prophetically* in the name? That that form of words which had just expressed his soul's agony when he believed that a terrible woe was impending, was selected for designation by Abraham when overwhelmed with joy under a grateful sense of the divine interposition, *without any reference made by him in the name to the experienced mercy*, seems to me very improbable.

"But, observe, the author of the narrative embodied in it a *tradition* respecting the name, existing when he wrote, as it is said, *this day, in the mount of the Lord, it shall be seen!* That tradition, therefore, interpreted the name, and showed that, even at that time, long subsequent to the sacrifice, it was generally regarded *as having a future sense, and a scope then unaccomplished*,—a scope that had some relation to the mount of the Lord—probably to that very mount about which sacred associations cluster.

"The words of the Vulgate (v. 14), literally translated, are: 'And he called the name of that place 'the Lord sees;' whence it is said, *even to this day*, on the Mount, the Lord will see.' The same verse is, in the Bible published by the pastors and professors of the Church of Geneva, A. D., 1588, rendered in French, of which the following is an exact version: 'And Abraham called the name of that place *the eternal will there provide.*' Of which it is said, '*This day*, in the Mount of the Eternal, it *shall be provided.*'

"I conclude, then, that the words in question, which had, perhaps, expressed an *unconscious* prediction of the Lamb of God, when they were addressed by Abraham to his son, before

the sacrifice of the burnt offering, were, after that event, *consciously* used by him in the designation, with the same prophetic import, and that, after the future of the great sacrifice had been pre-intimated by means of the occurrences on Mount Moriah. *a*

"A very imperfect view would be taken of the Abrahamic narrative as a prophecy, if we were to leave unnoticed a remarkable utterance of Christ. Before considering it, however, I offer these necessary introductory observations:—

"We learn from St. Luke's Gospel that Christ directed the minds of the two disciples whom he joined on the way to Emmaus, perplexed, as they were, about recent occurrences at Jerusalem, to what had been written by 'Moses and the prophets' 'concerning himself.' I am inviting you now, on this his express authority, to compare facts and events furnished by the Greek Scriptures, and expressly referring to him with that ancient record selected by me, which, as I suppose, had such designed prophetic aspect; and I do so in order that you may determine, by the applied use of your reasoning faculties, whether a result of the comparison is not *evidence* of there having been a pre-determined connection between what the old history presents, and that which is told in the new.

"When Christ so interpreted the Hebrew page, He—as the two were aware—had died by crucifixion; and his *dead body*, which had been laid in a tomb, had been, after an interval of three days, no longer found therein, nor had it afterwards, *as such*, been seen by human eyes.

"He taught the disciples to infer that 'the crucified one' was then alive, from evidence pointed out to them, derived from Moses and the prophets. You, in effect, are being now so taught by Him relatively to the subject of our discussion; while you may be sure that he did not leave unnoticed 'in all the Scriptures' as 'concerning himself' the narrative under review. I now invite your attention to the utterance of our Lord to which I have adverted.

"The original of John viii. 56, will not bear the sense of a

*a.* Dr. Pusey thus wrote to the old Judge: "'Jehovah Jireh' must signify 'The Lord will provide,' but it is not marked in the context whether Abraham so called the place as a memorial of the provision which God had made, or whether he so called it in reference to one yet to come. I have no doubt myself, that it was then that our Lord's words were fulfilled 'Abraham rejoiced to see my day and was glad.' So that I believe that the words do refer to that provision yet to come. But I do not see that it lies so clearly in the words that God would provide another lamb, that they will bear the weight of being alleged as an independent prophecy."

With every good wish,

Yours very faithfully,

Christ Church.

E. B. PUSEY.

\* Beng  
accompan  
the judge  
had seen'

au  
AV

pre  
spo  
the  
had  
our  
his  
been  
"T  
mine  
reali  
That  
"T  
tions  
'frier  
cation  
made  
of our  
secrets  
Abrah  
posed  
"It  
ancien  
reason  
reason  
in ques  
may h  
while r  
sonably  
sense in  
"The  
general  
dience  
may, ne

present seeing, &c., *relatively to the time when the words were spoken.* They necessarily import, that the patriarch, before then, *had* rejoiced that he should see Christ's day, and that he had, before then, seen it, and was glad. It is certain that, if our Lord had designed to intimate a 'seeing' by Abraham *in his disembodied state*, a different form of language would have been used.

"The verse speaks of two successive conditions of Abraham's mind relatively to rejoicing, viz: anticipation of joy, and joy realized. Both are asserted to have been experienced by him. That could only have been when he was in the flesh. \*

"The patriarch, who stood to Jehovah in the intimate relations in which history presents the 'father of the faithful'—the 'friend of God'—could not have refrained from earnest supplications for a disclosure of the mode in which the great promises made to him were to be accomplished; whilst, even irrespective of our Lord's declaration, the fact of the extent to which the secrets of divine counsels are related to have been revealed to Abraham, presents strong ground for inference that his supposed supplications would not be made in vain.

"It is a necessary rule of interpretation that in a case of very ancient occurrence, in which direct proof cannot be expected, reasonable conjecture, *unopposed by conflicting conjecture as reasonable*, must be received as sufficient evidence of a matter in question. Of that rule this case is an illustration. The day may have been seen by Abraham on the occasion supposed, while no other occasion is presented by history, nor can be reasonably conjectured, on which it could have been seen in any sense implied by the words of Christ!

"The following further considerations are involved in the general subject of our inquiry: first, though his faith and obedience were tried on the particular occasion, the mode of trial may, nevertheless, have been also used to enable the friend of

\* Bengel's note is, "Abraham's exultation preceded his seeing, and again joy accompanied his seeing, etc." This great commentator, therefore, understood—as the judge did—that the patriarch, when on earth had desired to 'see, and on earth had seen' 'Christ's day.' *Of the day, he says "It presupposes all the times of Christ even in the eyes of Abraham."*

God to foresee Christ's day; second, assuming the supposed prevision, it was necessary that the disclosure should be so guarded as not to affect *progressive* revelation to the human race; third, on that assumption, and in view of that necessity, it is not possible to conceive of a mode of preintimation more suitable than that which the narrative presents.

"For reasons already stated, Christ's declaration, then, may be adduced, in connection with the virtual sacrifice, Abraham's history and the Greek Scriptures, as an unexceptionable element in an argument to prove from prophecy fulfilled after a lapse of ages, the divine origin of the principal features of the biographies of Christ.

"And now, young man, I assert, as my too protracted homily draws to its close,—having regard to Abraham's prevision of 'Christ's day,' and to the harmonies that have been under consideration—*harmonies that cannot reasonably be accounted for except on the hypothesis of prescience and design*,—that a sound mind, comparing the Hebrew narrative with the Greek Scriptures, cannot fail to see in those combined subjects of review *a supernatural foreknowledge of that great event which history records as having happened after a lapse of eighteen centuries; and consequently to infer a divine source of what is related in the New Testament respecting the stupendous sacrifice which is a subject of it.* \*

"To my mind it is not less a conviction that Abraham saw 'Christ's' day when and as I have supposed, than is the evidence possessed at this moment by my optical sense, that I behold the sun's last rays irradiating the fresh turf upon the Micmac's grave that suggested these observations.

"If what I have offered for your consideration does not, in your judgment, constitute evidence such as you demanded of me, my failure to redeem the pledge I gave, must be ascribed, not to a bad case, but to a defective manner of presenting a good one. Bear in mind, however, that it is *evidence* that I promised to you, not demonstration."

Here again I interposed, and said "I cannot accept your

\* Warburton wrote thus :—"That Abraham then rejoiced to see Christ's day and saw it and was glad," is not only most certain, but of the highest importance to be rightly understood. And that I may not be suspected of prevarication on this head, I shall illustrate God's truth by the noblest instance that was ever given, of the harmony between the Old and New Testament."

Div. Leg. B. vi. s. 5. p. 591.

\* John  
xix. 23-2



alleged authority for the words reported in John viii. 56, seeing I question the genuineness of that gospel. I regard as a myth the narrative in Genesis, while I think the authorship of it cannot be referred to Moses. Moreover, such a disclosure to Abraham of the mode of fulfilment of '*the promise in Isaac*' as you suppose, would not have comported with that plan of progressive development of the plan of redemption which the Hebrew Scriptures present."

Whereupon the Judge thus rejoined: "Your last objection I have anticipated, and answered by showing that '*Christ's day*' was *in fact*, revealed to Abraham. My argument so far as it rests on the supposed harmony, is not affected by your hypothesis of a myth, nor by a question of authorship of Genesis. I do not apprehend your grounds of objection to the fourth Gospel, as you have not stated them.

"As, however, you challenge the fact of the utterance, I must enquire, 'Does the verse referred to truly report the words on which I rely?' If it does, my argument, so far as it rests on those words, stands for what it is worth. If the report be not true, the gospel is spurious. On that point I would observe, that document is the work of one who, from internal evidence, was acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, which contain the narrative reviewed. It has a prospective reference to Christ's day so probable, that no reflecting man can read it with the gospels, without perceiving that there may be an interrelation between these two things.

"Now, the object of what Christ is asserted to have uttered was, to convince the Jews that the Patriarch, whose seed they boasted themselves to be, had exulted in having seen his day, and yet the pseudo—John does not make Christ say 'your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it *in what is written!*' The writer thus exceptionally dealt with his subject relatively to the Old Scriptures, as you will perceive if you refer to the texts of which I shall hand you a minute. \*

---

\* John ii. 14, 16, 17; iii. 14, 15; v. 45, 46; vi. 44, 45; xii. 12-16; xii. 37-41. xix. 23-25.

" This exceptional negative treatment of the narrative, if the writer was John, would be in harmony with the consciousness of that Apostle, because he knew that for Christ, at the time of the supposed utterance to have referred, in addressing perverse Jews, to a particular prophecy that pointed to his *future* sacrifice, would have tended to mar the plan of making inter-relation between prediction and event evidence after, *but not before* fulfilment.

" The exceptional circumstance, indeed, furnishes an argument for the genuineness of the particular gospel. 'Ars—celare artem' is not shown here, if the verse was written to deceive by relating a fiction. An impostor would not have failed to add an express reference to a narrative so apposite and so obvious.

" Your objection while questioning the words, disputes, in effect, the genuineness of the whole dialogue between Christ and the Jews ; and yet that dialogue is natural and truth-like, and not in any respect out of harmony with the synoptic gospels. I conclude then first, that the words were uttered ; second, that they declared what was believed to be true, inasmuch as there was an absence of any conceivable bias that could have influenced the utterer to state what was not true ; (you oblige me thus to speak, as if I was dealing with a question of mere human testimony) third, that the words referred to the occasion reported in Genesis, which alone can give effect to them."

Here I observed, " You must prove *Christ's resurrection* before I can accept your reasoning, founded on what He is reported by Luke to have said, *after his death*, to the two disciples." To which the judge replied thus : " Have you ever considered the nature and the amount of evidence on which man is often constrained to act in the ordinary affairs of life ? It is far below demonstration ; but it is in kind and degree that by which we might, before experience, have expected a divine revelation to be supported, if we consider *that as man is constituted, this last could not be to him a subject of demonstration*.

Ch  
the  
had  
fulf  
I an  
cern  
clare  
were  
"  
Crea  
excep  
ask,  
huma  
ed co  
which  
histor  
revela  
from  
where  
of a su  
circum  
diction  
sound  
of the  
Greek  
purpose  
times, o  
" Wh  
what H  
Revelat  
epistle o  
" The  
race. V  
faith by  
this mor  
future a

"There is a philosophical truth involved in these words of Christ, 'If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rise from the dead.' This is as if he had said: 'If man, as God has made him, is not convinced of a fulfilment by what he sees me to be, and hears me declare that I am, of *that which Moses and the prophets have written concerning me*, he would not be persuaded that I am what I declare myself to be, by manifested supernatural agency, if that were exercised to convince him.'

"We may be sure that no kind of evidence would be by his Creator proposed to man, affecting his moral responsibility, except that which is adapted to his nature. We may well ask, What evidence of a revelation assumed to be divine could humanity demand that it does not possess? The evidence afforded could only be *genuine prophecy of a future state of things which could not have been foreseen, but has become a fact in history*. Every other conceivable kind of evidence of a divine revelation must consist of facts—not evidence in themselves,—from which certain inferences may or may not be drawn; whereas, from two indisputable facts, viz: distinct prediction of a supernatural future, and a future occurrence of a state of circumstances exactly harmonizing with the subject of the prediction, certain inferences, *and those only*, can be drawn by a sound and unprejudiced human mind. This may be predicated of the Hebrew Scriptures in relation to what we read in the Greek Scriptures. Miracles, after they have served their first purpose, would, if continuing to be performed in all future times, cease to be miracles in human apprehension.

"When Christ declared fulfilled prophecy to be evidence of what He was and what He taught, He implicitly declared that Revelation, in the light of His life, proves itself. The first epistle of Peter conveys the same truth.

"The providence of God has given *written* records to our race. Without the means of establishing the ground of our faith *by the new Scriptures, read with the old*, man would, at this moment, be destitute of all reliable information as to his future after death. All with him would then be mere specula-

tion concerning the insoluble, as it is in fact, now, with those who,—declining to accept Christ as God's voice speaking by human lips, and contented with a system of ethics, constructed by themselves, which has no certain—if any—aspect beyond the life that now is; or with scientific researches into the nature of physical man,—do not choose to avail themselves of the means of evidence of a future state which the Scriptures proffer. Those men live objects of worship in respect of their intellects by their fellow men, and die without giving any sign as to posthumous expectations. But they, happily, are not doomed *necessarily* to deal with the *insoluble*, in a matter of such deep interest.

"Christ, who 'brought immortality† to light'—progressively developed as the end and the sum of all prophecy—may be read on almost every page of the Hebrew Scriptures, which cover the whole period of the history of man that preceded the dawn, when 'the day spring from on high visited us.'

"Take an illustration of this, connected with the particular subject of our discussion, applying what I have already observed in relation to it.

"There is in the oath of Jehovah at the close of the occurrences on the Mount (Gen. xxii. 16–18), and in the subsequent Scriptural references to it, that which indicates, unmistakably, that what we read in the narrative cannot be confined in reference to Abraham and Isaac, nor to them in connection with the Jews, nor to the *land* of promise. It shows that what is related has a manifest prophetic aspect of a *person*, in whose advent the whole race of man would be interested.

"The oath, after having been referred to subsequently in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, is noticed, with an *implied* reference to Christ, in Micah, and culminates with an *express* reference in Luke to *our Lord, as the object to which it and the promise sanctioned by it pointed.* \*

\* The Judge, on request, furnished this note of the references: Gen. xxiv. 7; xxvi. 3; 1. 24; Exod. vi. 8; xxxiii. 1; Numb. xxxii. 11; Deut. 1, 8; vi. 10; xxx. 20; Mic. vii. 18–20; Luke 1, 68, 75. See also Jer. xxxiii. 16. This last identifies the *land* of the oath with the *person* of it,—'The Lord our Righteousness.'

† Gr., 'Incorruption.'

lin  
ser  
Mo  
Ch  
"  
cor  
fort  
"  
Res  
assu  
of co  
"  
whos  
your  
to co  
and i  
estab  
basis.  
acqu  
baptis  
son; y  
a filial  
his dy  
protect  
as you  
extract  
The  
my ass  
John a  
your i  
my inti  
princip  
spect e  
"Pro  
Revelat

"We find, indeed, in the oath and the references, a series of links forming a continuity, at the extremes of which are presented Isaac and *his great Antitype*; the virtual sacrifice on Moriah and *the real sacrifice on Calvary*; Abraham's day and *Christ's day*.

"Surely this, extending over a long period of time, and recorded by the pens of different writers, cannot be regarded as a fortuitous combination of historical atoms!

"When you object want of evidence in relation to the Resurrection, you question Christianity which depends on that assumed fact. Of the testimony necessary to prove it, I can, of course, speak in brief and general terms only.

"You pass among men for the son of my late revered friend, whose name you bear,—of him who is reputed to have been your father; but my *intellect*, if it is to be exercised, in order to conviction in that matter which rests entirely on reputation and inference, demands, *as you remind me*, strict evidence to establish that which, *though highly probable, has no certain basis*." I rejoined, "My father and mother were your intimate acquaintances; you were present at their nuptials and at my baptism; you know that I was always treated by them as their son; you wrote my father's will, whereby he devised to me, by a filial designation, the estate which I enjoy; you stood beside his dying bed, and heard him commend me, as his son, to your protection. These circumstances are, it is true, inferential, but as you do not adduce any opposing facts, the evidence of my extraction which the facts furnish is practically conclusive."

The old judge replied, "I marvel that you should challenge my assumed matter of testimony, derived from the Gospels of John and Luke, and yet argue, as you have done, in support of your immediate ancestral descent. Your argument removes my intimated doubts respecting your filial relation, while it, in principle, supports my views on the main question, as it respects evidence for Christianity.

"Prophecy fulfilled, as a principle of evidence relatively to Revelation, is the essential ground of my argument addressed



to you. I regard Genesis xxii. as a prophecy, and John viii. 56, as in effect showing it to be such. The mode and circumstances of the fulfilment of it are the subject of our Greek Scriptures.

"Of a divine source of those there exists inferential evidence abundantly sufficient to establish it, until it be proved, as it never has been, either that the facts which Christians believe to support the inferences are false, or that the inferences are not warranted by the facts.

"The character of Christ, as presented in the fourth Gospel, while not inconsistent with anything we read of Him in the Synoptics, is in respect of purity, simplicity, sublimity and self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of humanity, entirely real. It is not an ideal conception, but a genuine representation. The document throughout bears the stamp of an honest conviction in the mind of its author,—of the truth of what he wrote.

"Christ's last discourse to his disciples could have been written by no one save by him who had entered into the very heart of Christ. \*

"The reception, as authentic, of the document by the whole Christian world, before the close of the second century, precludes a possibility of a forgery being accomplished, at any time in that century, without detection and exposure.

"The following proof of the authorship of it, which is presented on its surface, is not, I think, subject to any reasonable objection. Verses 30 and 31 of chapter xx, complete what was first written; the author, in those verses, declaring in effect that what he had professed in the proem to show respecting 'the Word,' had been accomplished by '*the signs of Jesus, done in the presence of the disciples,*' which the writer had related. The language of those verses plainly indicates that the writer knew, when he wrote them, that there were other signs, &c., which he had not then told, and had not at that time designed to tell. Verse 23 of the last chapter shows, as clearly, what it was that, as an after thought, suggested the narrative of that

\* By some minds John xix. 26, 27, will be regarded as a vivid illustration in respect of genuineness of the document. The few words read there speak the language of reality and truth. It may be said that the designation, in the connexion, as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," of him to whom the Sonship is assigned, makes fraud inconceivable in relation to the author.

Note the "how" of verse 27 is the "how" of John ii. 4. that — is indicated.

John viii.  
and circum-  
our Greek

al evidence  
proved, as it  
ans believe  
rences are

th Gospel,  
him in the  
mity and  
irely real.  
resentation.  
onest con-  
what he

een writ-  
ery heart

he whole  
ury, pre-  
, at any

h is pre-  
asonable  
that was  
in effect  
specting  
us, done  
related.  
e writer  
gns, &c.,  
designed  
what it  
e of that

iden-  
read  
that  
es  
read

other sign which is the main subject of the chapter, superad-  
ded under these circumstances.

"After the Church had possessed the document ending at  
verse 31 of chapter xx, the author—assumed to be John—be-  
came aware 'that a rumor had gone forth among the brethren'  
that that apostle was to live until the advent of Christ. To  
correct this dangerous error, attributed by 'the beloved dis-  
ciple,' not to a misconception of anything that he had narrated,  
but to a misunderstanding, derived from some incorrect *oral*  
relation of Christ's words addressed to Peter, at the sea of  
Tiberias, John wrote, or possibly when his hand failed to  
write, dictated to selected persons, the substance of what we  
read in chapter xxi, up to verse 23, inclusive of that verse.

"It was, of course, necessary for him to state the sequel of  
the narrative; and he deemed it expedient to do so by means  
of a circumstantial statement of that one of '*the many other*  
*signs, etc., not written in the book*' of which it was the sequel.  
This constitutes now an appendix; and that the writer would  
naturally commit to the persons so chosen who, *as it had not*  
*appeared in what was first written*, would be asked to attest  
it. That the attestation is anonymous, is not inconsistent with  
the view expressed, since they who attested probably published  
—without subscription, but with the knowledge of the Church  
—the whole document as we have it, excepting the last verse  
of the last chapter.

"Verse 24 is in form an attestation *from without*, and should  
be read as such. It never existed in any known manuscript  
otherwise than with its present connections.

"That a forger—even assuming him to have been a Gnostic,  
and that, as such, he could have felt an interest in forging it—  
thus indicated the author to be one well known by all Chris-  
tians of the time, in fact or by immediate tradition, as '*the dis-  
ciple whom Jesus loved*,' etc., is not conceivable, because, on  
the hypothesis, he declared what he must have known would,  
on publication, be pronounced and proved to be false. *d*

"The things' referred to in the 24th verse I take to be 'the

a. On the point of authorship it is Frank's as a professing  
Christian in view of his documents should doubt. The  
question raised is: (1) Is the disciple pointed to in John XXI  
24? From the recorded relations of the Apostles to their Lord  
it must be Peter, James or John. Read the narratives of (1) the  
petition for bread of the two sons of Zebedee. (2) the  
transfiguration. (3) The Last Supper. (4) the agony in the  
Garden. It is not Peter because he (3) addressed the  
disciple in question. It is not James, for he had been

occurrences at the sea.' This is, as I think, probable, as 'the disciple' had been specially mentioned before only in connection with the explanation respecting the rumor, and because the original document required no such sanction, it having been already accredited by the Church. If the facts were as supposed, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' by necessary implication, is identified with the author of the Gospel, as fully as if the 'things' of verse 14 meant the original document together with the appendix. The style of the attestation, reminding of John 12, — used perhaps as an exemplar — is not opposed to my hypothesis of interpretation. As to who wrote the last verse of the last chapter, that is, as it seems to me a question of no importance, as the 30th verse of chap. xx had previously expressed, in substance, all that the redundant verse in question contains.

"The harmonious completeness that the whole document, apart from the supplement, presents, in respect of the introduction compared with the close, would strongly sway my mind to a belief of the Johannean authorship.

"The assumed author — John, and he *alone* of all the evangelists — wrote of Christ, in this Gospel, first, *that he was bound* before he was brought to ~~trial~~; second, *that he was made to bear his cross*, on the way to the place of crucifixion; and both, *without reference to any antecedents*. Read with this that part of our narrative which is found in Gen. xxii. 6, 9; asking, if the harmony — unnoticed by the writer — which is presented by a comparison of the old Scripture with the Gospel in question, suggests *forgery*, or genuineness, in relation to the latter.

"If you, pursuing a course of reasoning suggested by yourself, will gather and weigh all that history, contemporary and future, sacred and profane, tells us, bearing on what is related in the Christian documents concerning 'the resurrection of our Lord,' including the report of what Christ's followers did and suffered on the faith of the doctrine; and will consider, also, the historical fact of the influence which the name of Christ has exercised, and is exercising, on the opinions, conduct and

beheaded before the Fourth Gospel was written. It is impossible that the reference in verse 24 can be to the victim of Herod. Acts xii. 1, 2. Therefore, assuming the trifle alternative, the reference in v. v. 20, 24 must be to St. John. Cf. Matt. x. 2; John xix. 26, 27; Rev. i. 2.

John xix. 25

Caiaphas

conditions of humanity—you cannot but regard the resurrection of Jesus—especially as his dead body, after it was placed in the tomb, was never produced by those Jews who put Him to death—as sufficiently proved. (See Mat. xxvii. 62-66.)

“Of it, as of the Gospels that declare it, there is evidence, and strong evidence,—I need not assert it to be conclusive evidence.

“To sceptical intellectualists, these views will, perhaps, fail to commend themselves. One of those whose life is irreproachable, and whose love for his race is large and generous, but who divorced Christianity, with which he had formed a close alliance, in describing, as he lately did, and with consummate ability, the powers and the utterances of a great representative man, spoke thus to a cultivated English audience: ‘The Hebrew muse which taught the lore of right and wrong to men, had the same excess of influence for him it has had for the nations. Swedenborg and Behmen both failed, by attaching themselves to the Christian symbol, instead of to the moral sentiment which carries innumerable christianities, humanities, divinities in its bosom.’ ‘We should have listened,’ he added, ‘on our knees to any angel who could hint to human ears the scenery and the circumstances of the newly-parted soul; but it is certain it must not be inferior in tone to the already known works of the artist who sculptures the globes of the firmament and writes the moral law.’ Here we have what this intellectually great man—for such he is—accepts, in lieu of what, in the crisis of life, he would go upon his knees to welcome, at the hands of an angel commissioned to reveal it!

“The great artist who sculptures the globes of the firmament and writes the moral law,’ is sometimes pleased to overwhelm with sudden destruction, and with great agony, thousands of human beings by some terrible catastrophe, and among those the most helpless and harmless. This, to a Christian, presents no argument against God’s love for the whole human family, because Revelation shows the fact to consist with that love; but if he who does not accept Christianity, could gravely

propose for consolation to a suffering victim of a calamity so fearful, 'the moral sentiment which carries christianities, etc., in its bosom,'—his must, indeed, be an exceptional and abnormal constitution of humanity! The sufferer so appealed to would surely feel the appeal to be a heartless mockery of his sufferings!

"Miserable comforters then are those who see a God of love in nature only!

"At 'the inevitable hour,' 'the moral sentiment,' so heard in nature, may be more comfortable to a philosopher who relies upon it, than *evidence afforded by the Hebrew muse—with her 'love' enlightened and applied by Him of whom the distinguished American speaks with faint praise as 'the good Jesus'*—but I will humbly trust, at that hour, to be inspired to rest my faith upon the latter.

"The Abrahamic narrative, with its adjuncts, and in the connection in which I have presented it, for all humanity—intellectual and untutored—is, as the moral sentiment in nature is not, in its nature and according to man's nature, *evidence* for the conscious spirit of man to rely on as to its state and condition when it is separated from its earthy tabernacle—inasmuch as it presents to the human mind with precise pointedness a harmony even to minute particulars,—*a harmony whose source must be divine*—between what is related in the 22nd chapter of Genesis, and the consummation of the scheme of redemption, by the sacrifice of Jesus of Nazareth related in the Greek Scriptures.

"Regarded in connection with that large class of Hebrew Scriptural testimony of a kindred nature, which conduces to the same result, it is evidence of irresistible force.

"Christ declared, before he suffered, 'that when He should be lifted up He would draw *all* men unto Him.' A partial performance of that promise—and in a large and increasing measure—is a patent fact. An infidel writer of considerable ability asks, flippantly, 'If the Christian's God is to be measured by the miraculous cure, or by the suffering millions?' I



can, in view of what has been promised, and what has been performed, patiently await the assured result of a perfect fulfilment of our Lord's promise.

"While learned men in our day are sedulously and worthily engaged in studying the dark characters of slabs and cylinders, in the hope of extracting secrets of ancient days, that may serve to illustrate the sacred Scriptures, they do not, perhaps, apprehend—and, it may be, because it lies so near to the surface—that confirmation of a Christian's faith that may be read on the page of the old Hebrew story that has been the subject of our discussion.✱

"I am persuaded that the conclusion to which that subject, with its connections, rightly apprehended, necessarily leads, presents, to the most highly cultivated mind of man, when tossed on a troubled sea of speculation, as to the *what*, the *wherefore*, the *whence* and the *whither* of the humanity which is identified with its consciousness, an anchorage in the harbor of the Christian Revelation, at which it may ride in confidence and security."

Here the old judge and I—setting a good example to all theological controversialists—exchange cordial valedictions, and,

"As fades the glimmering landscape on the sight,"

retire from the Micmac's grave and seek our respective homes.

ADOLESCENS.

WINDSOR, NOVA SCOTIA, CANADA.

"The 'Old Judge' might have unexceptionably summed up thus:—"Abraham 'exulted that he should see Christ's day.' What it was that he saw, and greatly rejoiced to see in it, is as certain as if it had been expressly revealed to us. It could only have been preinformation ~~preintimation with certain day~~ respecting the mode in which the *promise that affected the nations* would be accomplished. Now, this feature is plainly impressed on the transaction related in Genesis xxii.—read with John viii. 56—viz: a preintimation to Abraham *that he by whom the promise would be performed, was to be 'the only son' of his father—'the son whom the father loved; that he, in compliance with the will of his father, and with his own consent, was to be the innocent victim of a sacrifice; and that he was to be, after the sacrifice, released from the bonds of death.* We shall look in vain for the occasion to which John viii. 56 refers, outside of the Hebrew narrative; whilst to search for it *there* Christ has instructed us! See Luke xxiv. 25-27. We find it therein, and we have thus before us evidence that the Great Sacrifice which purchased our Redemption was predetermined, and preintimated to one of our race more than seventeen centuries before it was an event in history. The case presents, not merely a type or a prophecy of that Sacrifice, which the human mind may or may not accept, but a *revelation* of it made long before it took place, to the consciousness of a representative man, which, logically, must be accepted *as such*, in view of the narrative and the Scriptures referred to.

See Supplement.